

~~SECRET~~

~~EYES ONLY~~

23 April 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Basic and Geographic Intelligence

SUBJECT : Geography Division Review of the Inspector General's Report

REFERENCE : Your memorandum of 6 April 1970

1. In accordance with your instructions, I have studied those portions of the IG's Report which were supplied to the Geography Division for review, and I am submitting herewith my comments. As you are fully aware, I am commenting as Acting Division Chief, and my comments inevitably reflect to some extent my own personal ideas of management and philosophy concerning intelligence production. I have not discussed the Report or my comments with [REDACTED] and I am sure that you will wish to have such discussions with him before you reply to the DDI.

25X1A9a

2. All in all, I feel that the IG Report reflects the results of a very thorough and probing survey. Some of their conclusions and recommendations are sound and constructive; others are based on a somewhat inaccurate total picture of the Division and its activities. In the effort to come up with positive recommendations, there may have been some tendency to give undue weight to evidences of problems. In my opinion, some of these problems are overstated in the Report, and probably reflect the giving of too much credence to the views -- perhaps very effectively expressed -- of a few individuals in the Division. This is not to deny that there are problems or that there is room for improvement. In all honesty, however, I feel that some of the problems identified involve a small minority of Division personnel. My comments are referenced to specific sections of the IG Report, identified by paragraph number, page number, or recommendation number as seems most appropriate.

3. Paragraph 2, page 1 of the Summary recommends some rotational interchange for younger officers between OBGi and other components of the Intelligence Directorate. As you recognize, this is not a new proposal. On the face of it, this sounds like a good idea for broadening the professional experiences of younger officers and contributing to their career development. Certain very practical questions arise however: can our younger geographic intelligence officers function adequately as economists within OER, or political scientists within OCI,

~~SECRET~~

~~EYES ONLY~~

~~SECRET~~

EYES ONLY

for example? In other words, do these other offices want to accept our younger officers on rotational assignments? Conversely, would we be able to use the OCI or OER specialists on rotation? I doubt it. Offhand, it seems to me that the most logical opportunities for rotational assignments of OBGi personnel elsewhere in the Directorate would be in OSR, CRS, DCS, and to some extent in IAS and in DDI staff jobs. The suitability of rotational assignees from other DDI elements for our work would remain, however, a critical problem. On balance, while some rotational interchange might be possible, I feel that opportunities for mutually beneficial experience from such interchange would be very few in number. ✓

4. Paragraph 5, page 2 of the Summary comments on the pace of the Intelligence Map Program and the need for a greater amount of other types of basic geographic research. This theme recurs several times in the Report, but it seems most appropriate to comment on it later in this memorandum. (See my paragraphs 7, 10, 11, 12, and 14, below.)

5. Paragraph 6, page 4 of "Structure and Management" comments on the lack of innovation since the inception of the Intelligence Map Program. I do not feel that the charge of lack of innovation is justified. The Geography Division has made considerable -- and I think considerable -- efforts to keep pace with new developments in overhead reconnaissance and its applications to geographic intelligence. We have also encouraged our people to gain greater familiarity with ADP and computer techniques, and with quantitative and statistical research methodologies, and to be alert to opportunities to apply them in our research effort. Since this charge of lack of innovation is aimed at the Office, the outstanding innovative work of Cartography Division in automated mapping should also be pointed out. ✓

6. Paragraph 6 also refers to signs of a developing schism between younger professional employees and management levels. One of the points touched upon concerns the adequacy of the Office's "public relations". As I discussed orally with you, I have been concerned in the past that the Office's "public relations" and its image among other parts of the intelligence community were not being represented as effectively as might be desired. It is my understanding that some changes have been made in such areas as upgrading the presentation of the lecture on OBGi for OTR's Introduction to Intelligence Course. This, I feel, is a good move. In addition, I feel that we might usefully re-examine the relative emphasis which we place on "public relations" with other parts of the Agency and intelligence community compared to our "public relations" with the outside academic world. I personally feel that our efforts to maintain close relations with the academic world have not been especially rewarding in contributing to our mission as geographic intelligence officers for the government. At the same time, I feel that we can usefully do much more by way of improving our "public relations" within the Agency and the intelligence community. X

~~SECRET~~

EYES ONLY

SECRET

EYES ONLY

7. In paragraph 6, reference is also made to a concern over the amount of initiative allowed individual analysts in contributing their expertise to the current problems which beset the Agency. I suppose it is inevitable that individual analysts -- especially younger analysts -- might feel that their expertise is not being fully utilized. They have, quite properly, a strong desire and a professional obligation to want to make a contribution. By the very nature of things supervisors and managers are responsible for evaluating opportunities for making contributions to intelligence problems. Since analysts are individuals, and supervisors/managers are also individuals, it is inevitable that there will be individual differences of opinion concerning what constitutes a legitimate opportunity for making a research contribution. I feel that the important thing here is that supervisors and managers keep an open mind and maintain an appropriately broad philosophy of the proper role of geographic research in support of national intelligence problems. If we have been too narrow in this respect in the past -- which is admittedly possibly true -- I feel that we must broaden our philosophy and give individual analysts a completely fair hearing on their proposals for self-initiated work. ✓

This recommendation
8. ~~Paragraph 4 and Recommendation No. 19, page 49,~~ suggests rescission of the present Geography Division policy requiring full editorial treatment of proposed Geography Division issuances before coordination with other substantive components. I agree with the IG recommendation. I feel that the primary substantive responsibility for our intelligence issuances lies with the analyst and the regional branch chief. Once these individuals are satisfied that a draft is ready for coordination, I feel that the coordination should proceed. Thus the comments of coordinating offices can be introduced into the draft before the editorial process and eliminate any need for a second editorial review.

9. Paragraph 5 and Recommendation No. 20, page 50, suggests that authors of Geography Division issuances be identified. I have no objection to the adoption of this practice, provided it meets with approval of the DDI and the Director of Security, although I doubt that the practice will have as much of a salutary effect on professional morale as the IG seems to suggest. The professional stature that counts, it seems to me, is that which an intelligence officer achieves in the eyes of his own supervisory echelons and his professional colleagues with whom he regularly maintains liaison and substantive coordination contacts. Neither group depends on formal author identification to recognize professional stature. Whatever policy is adopted on this matter should be consistent for all intelligence production offices within the Directorate, it seems to me.

10. Paragraph 10, page 53, comments concerning analyst attitudes toward the Intelligence Map Program and suggests a morale problem on the part of analysts who feel that they have too steady a diet of IMP work. The IG states that "new people reportedly must spend two years working on the IMP before they are assigned a major research project".

SECRET

EYES ONLY

SECRET

EYES ONLY

use

To the best of my knowledge this is simply not true, although there may be individual cases where a person has spent two years on a steady diet of IMP work; it is not a matter of policy. The IG also states that "fewer customer requests are approved and other geographic research projects are pretty much discouraged". I am unaware of any significant pattern of turning down customer requests. There has been some discouragement of other self-initiated geographic research project proposals; here my earlier comments concerning the philosophy of geographic research contributions to intelligence problems are pertinent. I do feel that the Intelligence Map Program, while obviously important and of great intelligence value, should never stand in the way of other needed geographic intelligence research, and that the target date for completion of the program should not be a rigid, inflexible matter. *In fact, we have robbed from the Program (etc. from H 7, page 2 - last sentence to end of P on p. 3)*

use

11. Paragraph 13, page 54, cites the case of a young man who "because of the negative attitude prevailing in the Division toward self-initiated projects" went to another Agency component to stimulate a requirement for a particular geographic study that he felt needed to be done. I am unfamiliar with the specific case cited, although I am aware that this type of thing has been resorted to on a few occasions. I am inclined to wonder: did the young man actually try to initiate the proposal within the Geography Division, or did he simply feel that a "negative attitude" prevailed and that his idea would be squelched? I reiterate my feeling that the Division management must not appear to discourage ideas from analysts for self-initiated projects. *use H 8 p. 3 of Dick's memo*

use

12. Paragraph 14, page 55, implies that the USSR and Far East Branches are so fully occupied with IMP work that an insignificant volume of non-IMP research and production comes from those branches. ~~As you know,~~ this is simply not true; the USSR and Far East Branches lead the Division in production not only of IMP sheets but in number and variety of other research products -- especially support projects -- as well.

use

13. Paragraph 14 also indicates that there is a feeling that the substantive production of OER and OCI frequently could be improved through a geographic intelligence input. There is, of course, some truth to this, and as a matter of fact I feel that the recent improvement in coordination procedures and substantive contacts with other DDI production offices is working toward this end. The idea of regular attendance by a Geography Division representative at meetings of the Central Intelligence Bulletin Panel, however, does not seem justified. ~~As you may recall~~ we looked into this matter in late 1968 or early 1969 when [REDACTED] at the suggestion of [REDACTED] sat in for a trial period on regular meetings of the Panel. [REDACTED] judgment is that the number of instances where meaningful contributions could be made was so few that regular attendance would not be justified.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

SECRET

EYES ONLY

~~SECRET~~

EYES ONLY

14. Paragraph 15, page 56, again refers to the difficulty of getting acceptance for self-initiated projects because of preoccupation with the Intelligence Map Program or because the proposed project "lacked applicability for intelligence". It further states that the chiefs of the USSR and Far East Branches tend to discourage their geographers from submitting recommendations for self-initiated projects. I have already commented concerning the relative priority of IMP work versus other geographic research, and concerning the need for a perhaps broader philosophy of applicability of geographic research to intelligence. I would simply say here that the chief of the Far East Branch and, so far as I know, the chief of the USSR Branch, do not discourage their geographers from submitting suggestions for self-initiated work. Obviously, not all suggestions would be favorably viewed at either the Branch level or the Division level. Again, this becomes a matter of individual judgment reflecting the supervisor/manager's own philosophy. I do feel that the Division can provide another outlet for individual initiatives and can make a useful contribution to the intelligence community by initiating a series which I will tentatively call "Geographic Background Notes". These would be simple, brief (usually one page) issuances on topics of routine intelligence interest, ~~roughly comparable to some of the items which used to be included in the Map Research Bulletin or the Geographic Intelligence Review. You will recall that I mentioned this idea to you at the time of our oral discussion of the IG Report, and I intend to move ahead as time permits with the preparation of a few samples of what I have in mind.~~

not

15. Summing up paragraphs 6 through 15, the IG proceeds to make Recommendation No. 21, page 56, which actually consists of four recommendations. First, that the D/BGI slow down the pace of the IMP schedule; second, that he insure that each geographer in the USSR and Far East Branches be assigned a research project other than the IMP periodically; third, that he insist that self-initiated projects be encouraged; and fourth, that he arrange to have one of his senior geographers participate in meetings of the Central Intelligence Bulletin Panel. I am opposed to any formal decision or formal announcement to slow down the IMP schedule. At the same time, however, I do feel that we should keep things in perspective and not let "completion of the IMP by a certain date" be an excuse for refraining from other legitimate geographic research. I doubt that an actual directive to assign occasional non-IMP research projects is necessary. Proposals for self-initiated projects should continue to be encouraged. My ~~paragraph 13, above, states my views on regular participation in the CIB Panel~~ *are stated above in # — above.*

16. In paragraph 7, page 71, reference is made to present Geography Division procedures regarding maintenance of manhour records and other statistical data. Recommendation No. 27, page 72, proposes a re-examination of statistical reporting programs and publication of guidelines for essential categories of statistical information required by

~~SECRET~~

EYES ONLY

SECRET
EYES ONLY

OBGI, in order to reduce statistical reporting activities to the minimum required to satisfy Office requirements. I understand that you are presently re-examining the need for statistical data by your own office. I would simply observe that this matter of statistical reporting is largely one of being able to satisfy the requirements of the next higher managerial level. Thus, it seems to me that the level of Geography Division need for statistical information will be determined very largely by the nature and extent of OBGI requirements on the Division for information that is supplied by these statistics. One other observation, for what it is worth: it is my understanding that the other intelligence production Offices have no comparably detailed requirement for the reporting of statistical information; yet I am sure that those Offices must be required to answer the same type of queries that we receive from DDI staff levels concerning planning, programming, and budget matters. Perhaps we as an Office have been overly "cautious, prudent, and traditional" in this respect.

25X1A9a
25X1C4a

17. [REDACTED] also commented that a number of analysts in the Geography Division were apparently unaware that they could be considered for an assignment as a [REDACTED] and that such [REDACTED] could be a career objective. This situation can be very simply handled by an announcement within the Division, although my own feelings on this matter are tempered by my opinion that a [REDACTED] assignment does not really contribute much to the career development of an OBGI geographic intelligence officer or to his advancement within the Geography Division.

25X1C4a

25X1C4a

[REDACTED]
Acting Chief, Geography Division

25X1C4a

SECRET

EYES ONLY